MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #163
Monday, December 7, 2009
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I   Call to Order – Jonathan Dehn

Faculty Senate President Jonathan Dehn called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

A.   Roll Call for 2009-10 Faculty Senate

Members Present:	Members Present (cont'd):	Others Present:
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken	THOMAS, Amber	Carol Gering
ALLEN, Jane	WEBER, Jane	Todd Vorisek
ANGER, Andy	WILSON, Timothy	Dana Thomas
BAKER, Carrie		Alex Hwu
BOGOSYAN, Seta		Walker Wheeler
BROCIOUS, Heidi (audio)	Members Absent:	Heather Curry
CAHILL, Cathy	BARTLETT, Christa	Frank Chythlook
CHRISTIE, Anne	DAVIS, Mike	Kayt Sunwood
DEHN, Jonathan	KOUKEL, Sonja	Cindy Hardy
DONG, Lily	LEONARD, Beth	Linda Hapsmith
FOWELL, Sarah	JIN, Meibing	Cindy West (audio)
GANGULI, Rajive (audio)	JOLIE, July	Joy Morrison
HANSEN, Roger	RALONDE, Ray	
HAZIRBABA, Kenan		
HOCK, Regine		
HUETTMANN, Falk (audio)	Non-voting Members Present:	
KADEN, Ute	Tim Stickel	
KERR, Marianne (audio)	Denis Wiesenburg	
KONAR, Brenda	Pete Pinney	
LARDON, Cecile	Adrian Triebel	
LAWLOR, Orion	Martin Klein	
LIANG, Jingjing	Brian Rogers	
MCINTYRE, Julie	Susan Henrichs	
MOSES, Debra (Diane McEachern)		
NEWBERRY, Rainer		
PALTER, Morris		
REYNOLDS, Jennifer		
ROBERTS, Larry		

B.   Approval of Minutes to Meeting #162

The minutes were approved as distributed.

C.   Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as distributed.

II   Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A.   Motions Approved:
        1. Motion to Reaffirm the Journalism Department Unit Criteria
B.   Motions Pending: None

III   Public Comments

Dana Thomas reported on the progress of the group working on the English writing sample for Mandatory Placement. They've made progress, including conducting and analyzing an experiment between human- and machine-scored writing samples. But, an extension of time to early next semester is needed to finish an implementation plan. Jon D. asked about the results of the experiment. Dana reported that machine and human scoring were identical, with a correlation of .8; however the group prefers human scoring and that's the proposal they're working on.

Linda Hapsmith of the Academic Advising Center reminded everyone that student nominations for the Feist/Schamel Outstanding Undergraduate Faculty Advisor Award were open through Friday, Feb. 5. Flyers with more details and nomination forms were left at the back table.

Linda also announced the capstone workshop (of their academic advisor series) with a panel of five former Feist/Schamel award winners that is taking place tomorrow (Dec. 8). Flyers were left at the back table about that event, also.

Christie Cooper and Kayt Sunwood announced a training on mediation on behalf of Earlina Bowden. A trainer is coming from Colorado to do a five-day, 8-hours per day training about how to become a mediator in this new UAF program. The training will focus on workplace problems and issues. There are flyers at the back table with more information. There is also a Maymester training planned, which might be more convenient for faculty schedules. Jon asked if there are costs for the training, and Christie said no and that those wishing to participate should speak to their dean or director for support in their candidacy to attend for their unit and use their time to attend (it's part of recognized university service). Jon then asked if it were possible for graduate students to attend the February training. Christie responded that it would be Earlina's call and to send her an email. There are 40 available seats in the training with 20 of those taken up already. Kayt Sunwood mentioned there will be a special session for students to participate in later on, which ASUAF is organizing. Bob Shefchik out of the Chancellor's office is overseeing the entire project. Cecile L. asked how

often mediators are called upon in a year's time, and Christie said about two times. With a larger pool to draw from in the future, though, the frequency could decrease. An effort is made to match those with complaints with a mediator from a different unit who is neutral and has no vested interest. Having more mediators makes that easier to accomplish.

Walker Wheeler, Rasmuson Library's IT manager and Unit 13 Staff Council member, spoke concerning the agenda item about the academic calendar. He requested consideration for IT when planning the academic calendar to allow for maintenance times of systems throughout the year. He had also made this request at the September Faculty Senate meeting and wished to give a reminder since today's agenda included the calendar topic.

IV   A.   President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn

The Systemwide Governance Council met for the first time this academic year (representing all three MAUs). They elected their chair, Joe Hayes, director of the Alumni Association. This is the first year that the Alumni Association has been included on the Council.

The Faculty Alliance, representing the faculty of all three MAUs, has met and made two motions which have been presented to the Board of Regents. The first motion, passing unanimously, was to support one capital construction project in the university's budget, which is the Life Sciences Building.

They also met with interior legislators and they passed along the info about the motion supporting the Life Sciences Building project to them. The legislators were pleased to see the faculty from all three MAUs united together in this.

The second motion was to encourage progress on the Academic Master Plan. They requested a timeline of when the Faculty Senates and Faculty Alliance would be able to review a draft of the plan. They're still waiting for the feedback from that request, and are hoping to hear back by their next meeting (which is on Friday, Dec. 11).

Regarding the UA Presidential Search, Jon had compiled a list of 13 names suggested to him for people to serve, and has taken four names of people who fulfilled the position criteria to the committee. It's still too early to make the list of names public yet. A letter from System Governance Council is being drafted by Martin Klein and Jon, expressing their interest to see the shortlist of names to be submitted to the President (in hopes of having an opportunity to provide feedback) before it goes to the Board of Regents.

        B.   President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill

The accreditation core themes are back on the agenda today. Dana Thomas is here to discuss them again with the Senate. Cathy mentioned the reasons for some of the changes made recently by Provost's Council and others. The theme for research, scholarship and creative activity were again split out so that each of those themes could accommodate more objectives and goals, increasing awareness and the ability to set goals for those themes. There will be the opportunity to discuss them today, as there are strong opinions on both sides of the discussion.

The outcomes of the Follett Bookstore meetings are on the agenda and will be recapped during discussion. Things seem to be getting better – they are listening to us and are willing to work with us to make the process better.

Reapportionment data for the Senate has brought up the timely issue of revising the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws. Please give Cathy feedback on any areas of those documents needing attention. Jennifer R. will report on the reapportionment data during discussion.

V   A.   Chancellor's Comments – Brian Rogers

BOR approved the operating and capital budgets this last week, as reported in the newspaper. In another seven days we'll hear from the Governor about it. Whether the Governor will put the Life Sciences building in the capital budget, or to what extent it's put in the budget, is still under active discussion. The Governor is including some deferred maintenance in a five year plan, netting the university $37.5 million a year. While it doesn't cover our annual need, it's better than we've been doing in recent years. Next full meeting of the BOR is February 17-18 here in Fairbanks. If the Senate has specific issues for the BOR to address, this will be the best opportunity to raise them.

Accreditation core themes are noted as being a discussion item on the agenda. He favors having two themes in the research, scholarship and creative activity areas. By only having one theme, he thinks we miss an opportunity in the evaluation process of these areas. We're a victim of the compressed process this time, limiting our time for ongoing discussions. He wishes there were more time for discussion as there would be if we had the full seven years in the process. Given the time constraints, he'll accept one theme this cycle, but next time around he wants more discussion and consideration of two themes.

Cecile L. asked if there were any discussion about the KUAC merger at the BOR meeting. Brian reported there was no discussion, but they may give a status report at the next meeting. A new general manager has been hired at KUAC. In terms of sequencing any change at KUAC, the first step is likely to be looking at how we address the shared provision of television content across the state. We've already been doing that in three communities. Adding a fourth is the next step, and if that works they'll talk further on other issues.

B.   Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

With regard to the Academic Master Plan, whatever happens (and we're not sure what the final form of the AMP will be), the Systemwide Academic Council remains definitely committed to having adequate time for review by Governance. None of the three provosts want this plan to go forward without faculty buy-in. It may be months before there's agreement on the kind of plan to put forward, but there will be adequate time provided for Governance reviews.

Adding to the remarks already made about accreditation core themes, the Provost added that most important to her is having wide buy-in from the campus community, particularly faculty. The first and foremost objective in the discussions of having accreditation themes is

that everyone involved agree that these themes are the components of the mission of UAF. The themes have three purposes: 1.) they're a way of structuring our response to the accreditors, to show what we are and what we do as a university; 2.) they're a way to communicate amongst ourselves and that's why agreement is important to the extent it can be achieved; and, 3.) the themes will also be used to represent us to our constituencies, including legislators, citizens, business people, and other stakeholders. UAF is the research university of Alaska, among a huge variety of many other things it does, including workforce development, developmental education, basic baccalaureate and liberal arts education, etc.; but, one of the things that make us unique is our high level of activity and accomplishment in research. The purpose of making research its own theme is to be able to adequately show what we do. If we combine it with the other components of scholarship and creative activity, it will be harder to give each area adequate and fair attention. From the administrative perspective, dividing them allows the areas to be given more attention, specifically in defining and developing the objectives. So, if the theme for these components is not split this time, then she hopes that discussion and consideration will be given to doing so for the next time UAF is under accreditation review.

Scholarship Reconsidered by Ernest Boyer describes the long-held view that the scholarship of discovery is research; and the author writes that scholarship at a university needs to encompass more than just discovery and research, to include the scholarship of teaching and learning, of integrating and synthesizing knowledge and the scholarship of applying knowledge. So, finding ways to encompass that breadth of scholarship by giving the different areas more attention does not decrease their importance, but allows them to shine.

VI   Governance Reports

        A. Staff Council – Martin Klein

Martin announced that Staff Appreciation Day preparation is underway for spring, and he invited faculty to share their programs during that day. A wide variety of topics are offered to staff that day. Please email him if there's any topic a faculty would like to share.

The staff tour at the Cold Climate Housing Project, sponsored by Staff Council, is available for 20 people, and it takes place tomorrow.

Staff Council's online election is open for voting through Dec. 11.

Work continues on the Staff Handbook/Directory project for university staff, with involvement of the HR department. It will be online and be a one-stop site with rules, regulations and information about working at the university.

Martin shared that two different unions are trying to organize staff on campus.

        B. ASUAF – Adrian Triebel

Adrian announced that he met with soon-to-be-vice-chancellor Mike Sfraga to talk about student-related topics to address next semester. He was also involved in the Follett

Bookstore meetings, organizing student involvement. He recently met with Earlina Bowden regarding the new mediation program. He's working on ASUAF elections. The student saver (discount) program continues, though progress is slow but consistent. Last Friday he was involved in the meetings on campus with legislators, which Jon D. spoke about previously. Adrian attended that last BOR meeting earlier this month, accompanying the Gay-Straight Alliance as they lobbied for the nondiscrimination policy. They also pushed for the Life Sciences Building at the BOR meeting.

Todd Vorisek, ASUAF vice president, handed out pamphlets about the Student Initiative for Renewable Energy Now (SIREN) fee of $20 each semester to go toward sustainable projects on campus. The student-initiated fee raises about $200,000 per semester, and the Chancellor has matched that amount, so right now there's $400,000 for the program. The fee will be charged for the next 10 years, generating around $8 million dollars (later in the meeting, Adrian corrected this figure to $5 million dollars). They want to work with faculty to have students appointed to the SIREN board from their departments. The pamphlet lists different units getting student appointments for the board. If faculty knows students they'd like to see working on the board from their departments, Todd encourages them to email him their names (email address shown on the pamphlet). Cecile L. asked what year students were preferred – Todd and Adrian mentioned any year is fine, but would prefer to have someone who will be here for several years over an outgoing senior. Todd mentioned that a tentative budget plan is shown on the back of the pamphlet. Ken A. asked if there is an application process for students to gain a seat on the board. He suggested that students should have a passion for the project, not merely a good association with administrators or faculty. An application process would bring that under consideration. Todd agreed that it would be worthwhile to pursue this idea.

C. UAFT/UNAC

Cecile L. mentioned that Abel Bult-Ito has a teaching conflict at this time, so is not here to speak regarding UNAC. Cecile said there's no news on the lawsuit that she's aware of.

VII   Guest Speaker: Karl Kowalski, Executive Director, OIT User Services
              Topic: Current distance/online delivery systems (e.g., Blackboard, eLive) and
              planned technology changes to distance delivery and other campus systems.

Karl mentioned the available distance ed tools of Blackboard (which is not just a distance ed tool), eLive, two-way classroom video conferencing and desktop video conferencing, in addition to audio conferencing.

With regard to the academic calendar issue on the agenda for today, OIT needs outage windows for system maintenance to occur. January 4 is when the upgrade for Blackboard starts, to apply security patches and add program building blocks, so it will be unavailable during Wintermester. They've worked with Summer Sessions staff to get UAF faculty access to UAA Blackboard during UAF's outage time. UAA provides eLive for all three campuses, however; and so it will be completely down for major upgrades during January 4-15.

Public information from UAF is now available on iTunes U. A couple of faculty have tried the course upload side on the backend of iTunes U. They're working on ways for course upload to be more seamless, as currently it's not an easy process and not for the computer novice.

Schaible Auditorium is now fully upgraded for lecture capture and all your PowerPoint presentations, audio and video delivery can be captured at once in the room. You also have control over what you post on the web or on Blackboard, whether audio stream, video stream or both together.

Thinking about the technology systems that have to be in place to support distance education, from the students' perspective, it's about discoverability. Students need to find out what courses are available to them, and then be able to access those courses. We have to do a better job letting students know what technology they need (based upon where they are) to participate in distance ed courses – access to technical resources varies widely across the state. Advising support and technological support for various systems are needed. They're working with the Center for Distance Education on non-duplicative series of technical training for faculty on how to do distance ed. Faculty can start at CDE to learn about the pedagogical differences in distance ed delivery and course design; and OIT can help with training in using the technology equipment or programs needed for distance ed.

Cecile L. mentioned her research takes her to rural areas, and though she'd like to teach her local class from a remote site she might be at, the local smart classrooms don't allow for even audio conferencing because there aren't phone jacks in the rooms. Karl said that deans and directors have also raised these types of issues, and he addressed them on this topic at Provost's Council a few weeks ago. They've reached a sort of technology crisis with smart classrooms on campus. Many of the classrooms were upgraded with one-time money and operating costs have not kept up. So, the performance issues have caught up with them and Chancellor's Cabinet is looking at the maintenance money issues. OIT wants to survey the faculty on what tools they want available in smart classrooms. Faculty may see more classrooms go offline in the meantime; a couple of classrooms have gone offline due to equipment problems since last summer.

Roger H. mentioned that internet protocols have become very important to research units and their data acquisition and monitoring activities. What is OIT doing to help research units further their goals in this area? Karl mentioned that today he's presenting Chancellor's Cabinet with OIT's plan to upgrade campus infrastructure. Wired and wireless routing equipment on campus is in need of upgrading and has also suffered by the lack of funding of their capital requests by the legislature. It's going to take some time with internal budgets, but upgrading buildings is planned around campus. They've also submitted a million-dollar EPSCoR grant through the vice chancellor for research's office to specifically upgrade some key research technologies to give research units better access to the GCI bandwidth gift. The money will be used to provide faster access, greater bandwidth, and more redundancy for the research units. Roger H. asked what kind of access to the GCI bandwidth will be provided, using the example of needing to acquire data for their earthquake research from UAA. Karl said it would be two-pronged – currently, UAA runs the metropolitan area network for all of south-central Alaska with 45 meg connections and it's Karl's understanding that research instrumentation should now be routed through that higher bandwidth from UAA back to

here. (If that's not the case with something they know of, let OIT know and they'll track it down.) Fairbanks is the GCI access point from here, so if there's data at Nome, for example, it's going to come from the Nome circuit, rather than from a GCI access point.

Dana T. asked for Karl to speak about departmental email accounts because these are referenced all over the UAF web site and university publications and are necessary to UAF's business. Dana wanted to know about the timing of the email changeover, and how OIT is coordinating this email changeover to accommodate the affected departments such as the Registrar's office and Marketing and Communications. Karl spoke about the current plan. There's one technical change needed by UAF that hasn't been done yet to accommodate Google to handle department accounts. March 1 is OIT's deadline for themselves to handle the necessary change for group accounts. No group account functionality will be turned off without the solution in place first. The advertised deadline of June 30 is their cutoff date, but they won't cut anyone off. OIT is behind, but they're working on it.

Jane W. asked what will happen to faculty who have not migrated their email account to Google Gmail by December 31. Karl answered that during the week of January 4 it will just happen. Jane also asked about the results of technology survey to faculty and staff regarding training. Karl hasn't seen the report yet, but it will be coming out of Joy Morrison's office.

Jingjing L. asked about the faculty web sites currently tied to the UAF email server. Karl said those pages will stay online. Jingjing said he had a problem getting access to his faculty web site after his email was changed over. Karl asked him to contact him so they could look into this. Rajive G. also mentioned this problem with accessing faculty web pages on 'faculty.uaf.edu'. He had to make a personal request to keep his old page up on the UAF server after changing over to Gmail. Karl said he hadn't heard about the problem and he'll look into it.

Karl noted that email forwarding from the UAF email server to Gmail will continue to occur for at least a year, though a 6-month deadline has been advertised to get people moving ahead. Chancellor Rogers mentioned his experience with the email forwarding, and he feels a full academic year and then some is reasonable for email forwarding to continue.

Lily D. commented about international access to Google Gmail accounts. She heard from John Lehman that you must forward your Gmail to a Yahoo account while abroad. China is blocking some Google sites. Karl will check into it. Jon D. said he has heard of this, also.

Jon D. asked if a standard protocol is in place to put content on iTunes U. Karl responded that the Faculty Senate could recommend and set procedures about how they want to handle content. Currently, Professor Stolzberg is putting Chemistry F105 lectures up, and OIT is not doing any monitoring or editing of the content. Chancellor Rogers mentioned that there are two parts to iTunes U: courses, and guest lectures. They want UAF to make information and guest lectures widely available to the world community. If there are audio or video recordings of guest lectures, let Marketing and Communications know about it and they'll add it online. Adrian T. mentioned *The Place Where You Go to Listen*, which is a unique sound and light environment at the UA Museum that he was told about by a student, and commented it would be something appropriate to put online. Jon D. thought that was an

excellent idea, noting that iTunes sends its customers to university resources that highlight their unique strengths and UAF should highlight its truly unique classes.

BREAK: 2:10-2:15 PM

VIII   New Business

    A.   Motion to Approve a Minor in American Sign Language (Attachment 163/1)

Ken A., co-chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee, said the committee agreed that having this minor available at UAF is preferred over students going elsewhere to obtain it. There was no opposition to the program whatsoever. It's clear cut and the Foreign Languages department supports it. Jon D. asked for a vote. Orion L. so moved and Falk H. seconded. The vote was unanimously in favor with no abstentions.

    B.   Motion to Restrict Core Natural Science Courses to Hands-on Laboratory Experiences (Attachment 163/2)

Rainer spoke to the motion. The Curricular Affairs Committee only just found out last week that core natural science courses without hands-on labs were occurring. The science faculty on CAC were shocked and appalled about this. Science is fundamentally about doing things, not just reading about things or watching computer simulations. Unless we can truly give students the experience of doing, measuring, watching, touching, and possibly tasting – to test out theories – they might as well be doing creationism. There is no substitute for these experiences in learning science. A core science course teaches students the fundamental aspects of science through doing.

Ken A. commented about the history of the core, saying that over time it has evolved without virtual labs ever being addressed. Falk H. talked about the timing of motion and why it came up so quickly – discussion of it in Administrative Committee and CAC occurred simultaneously, shortening discussion time by at least a week. Cathy C. stated that she couldn't agree more with Rainer's statement about science, but that perhaps this motion is written too broadly. She gave the example of a virtual lab used as one lab in a series of others that are hands-on for a particular course, which according to this motion would have to be thrown out. The motion needs revision and should go back to committee to be more specified so that a course that's 95% hands-on doesn't get dinged because of one virtual lab.

Jon D. asked how many courses will be impacted by this. That information wasn't available and Jon suggested it be looked into.

Jingjing L. stated his strong opposition to the motion. He feels the motion is unfair for the natural science courses; that sometimes the liberal arts courses need more hands-on than natural science courses. Why just restrict natural science courses with labs?

Regine H. asked about natural science core courses as distance ed courses. Rainer said they could occur as long as they included the hands-on activities. Rainer moved the motion go back to committee.

Brenda K. suggested discussion with those who've created these courses so they have a chance to provide feedback and present their rationale for teaching them. Rajive G. commented about being uncomfortable with the statement that a science course without hands-on activities isn't a science course. Rainer clarified that this motion is referring to core science courses which are required to have labs. Cathy C. talked about delivering chemistry courses by distance where lab components can be made available for hands-on experiments and there are many alternatives for providing hands-on experiences. Some labs in a course may have to be virtual ones based on their subject matter – astrophysics for example. So, the motion needs to be readdressed.

Ute K. commented that she feels this decision is too black and white. Not each science course is equal, and in Alaska not every science course can be delivered equally. She feels it should be done on a course by course basis, not in a way that raises more questions for courses as a whole. She feels it stifles education as well as the judgment of faculty. Rainer agreed that it is a black and white decision in the same way that you can't teach swimming without getting into the water.

Cecile L. asked if computer science courses are part of these core courses. They are not. She asked about computer modeling in the scientific fields. Rainer noted the process should start with reality first, then proceed on to modeling.

Ken A. observed that if totally virtual labs are allowed for core science courses, you've practically eliminated the lab requirement. Some hands-on is required and expected. This is what distinguishes the core requirement at UAF from other universities.

Jon D. mentioned that he'd like to see a list of criteria for labs, conceding that there are cases for virtual labs in some situations, but questioning if it should be the entire lab experience.

Ken A. and Falk H. invited all interested faculty to come and talk about this with them at CAC, and particularly in conjunction with the ongoing Core-LEAP discussions.

Rainer's motion was seconded and a unanimous vote sent this item back to committee.

IX   Discussion Items

        A.   Faculty Senate Reapportionment - Jennifer Reynolds
                (Attachment 163/3)

Jennifer outlined what was done and why it was coming before Senate now. The need for recalculating the Senate representation numbers from units was due, especially since five years had passed since the last calculations. Bylaws state that it should be done every two years according to a very specific formula. Faculty Affairs suggests that this intensive process and two-year timeline should be

discussed. Currently, the recalculation was completed by Anne Christie and Marla Lowder for Faculty Affairs this past fall.

To do this required data from the Provost's Office and every single faculty contract letter had to be reviewed to pull the required data out according to faculty appointments for each unit. There are 617 faculty qualifying for representation, and each appointment letter had to be reviewed to determine percentages of appointments in the units. Two corrections must then be applied to the results to determine unit representation totals, which Jennifer explained. The fulltime faculty equivalent (FTFE) calculation was used as specified in the bylaws, and this data changes from year to year. Because it's very difficult to get the needed level of data to run the calculation specified in the bylaws, other procedures were also looked at, using the same data set to compare what the end results would be utilizing a simpler procedure. All the results are in the attachment, shown in the tables for comparison. The larger table shows the results following the specified procedure in the bylaws. The second smaller table shows just the units that had changes and the difference for each of those units depending upon the method used to calculate the representation numbers.

Almost all the unit representation numbers remained the same, except for CNSM and CLA whose numbers were reduced. CNSM faculty rep numbers mainly dropped because of looking closely at the split appointments and assigning time to the research units (GI, IARC and IAB) according to the bylaws. This changes the representation numbers for research faculty and would provide the GI, IARC and IAB with their own representation. If the specified data corrections are not used, the GI and IARC would still have their own representation, but IAB would remain in CNSM for representation on the Senate.

The issues identified and options for dealing with them are included in the attachment. Some modification of the senate bylaws is needed because of the issues they identified in the process. Faculty Affairs wants the Senate to look at the options and discuss these as a body. Jon asked the Senate for suggestions for bylaws and constitution changes. Give feedback to FAC and Administrative Committee members. Jon solicits faculty input over the next semester.

      B.   Update on the Accreditation Core Themes – Dana Thomas
            (Attachment 163/4)

Dana T. brings two issues back to the Senate for discussion. First is the issue raised earlier by the chancellor and provost about splitting the *Discover* theme so that research is set apart from other scholarship and creative activity. The splitting of that theme into two is favored by Provost's Council and Chancellor's Cabinet.

A second item is the word "sustainable" that was added by the Senate to "economic development" in the *Engage* theme at the November Senate meeting. Provost's Council and Chancellor's Cabinet favor removing "sustainable" from the theme.

Carrie B. read a statement from the Theatre Department faculty:

> The faculty already considered splitting research away from
> scholarship and artistic creation. The reasons "we the faculty" had for
> wanting these unified in a single theme do not change, and "we the
> faculty" feel that splitting the themes into two categories is a problem.
> To the Chancellor's Cabinet, just as a thought experiment, we would like
> you to consider the idea of reversing the verbs and the themes in the
> expressed format. If one were to say:
>
> DISCOVER: Through Scholarship and Artistic Creation including
> an Emphasis on the North and its Peoples
>
> EXPLORE: Through Research
>
> Most researchers would probably feel like they are being sub-ranked
> below scholars and artists. "We the faculty" feel like they would be
> correct. This is why we think a unified theme that gives equal
> importance, weight, gravity, and institutional support to the various
> non-curricular professional endeavors of our community is important..

Also, Carrie B. asked for more details about the Provost's statement that splitting research from scholarship and creative activity would give them more prominence. She also wondered about the wording change from "creative activity" to "artistic creation" and why that was decided upon.

The Provost responded that for each theme there is the charge to develop objectives and they must identify ways to assess those objectives and ascertain whether the objectives have been met by the university. According to the accreditors, each theme gets approximately five to ten objectives, each of which are then addressed in our accreditation reports. The accreditation steering committee is struggling with developing appropriate objectives for the themes. With these broad themes, they need to come up with objectives that answer the question of whether or not they've been achieved. With research, at least in terms of organized research at UAF, there are a number of fairly standardized ways of looking at research, through number of research publications, research dollars, patents, and citations in journals, for example.

Scholarship and artistic creation look at different elements for assessing the quality of what's being produced. Objectives for these will have a different flavor than those for research programs. It makes it harder to capture an appropriate assessment of those kinds of activities within a broad theme that includes all of the different activities. Because sponsored research is a very large part of what UAF does, it would tend to obscure what our special accomplishments are in the area of artistic creation and scholarship by keeping them together. This does not in any way say that scholarship and artistic creation are not important, they are just different.

Dana T. added that the Commission will send an evaluator for each theme. If these areas are kept together, they will get one evaluator who would most likely be a scientific researcher,

given UAF's emphasis on research. So, we wouldn't get the same kind of feedback and guidance that could be obtained if they were separate.

Cecile L. commented that she continues to struggle with this bifurcation. The use of the word "research" in what she's heard expressed today is almost a code word for "funded research" which puts it in a different category. While some of her research is funded, there is still a lot of research that is meaningful and important though not externally funded. It's important to have this conversation and clarify what we mean within our institution. As a social scientist she sees herself as sitting in almost in the middle of this because she has funded research that is important to her, but she also does unfunded research and scholarship. Are we singling out funded research? If that is the case, then we should call it what it is.

Dana T. said he asked that same question specifically at Provost's Council, but the response was no. Buck Sharpton brought in the accreditation definitions of research, scholarship and artistic creation and argued from that perspective, right out of the accreditation handbook. Part of the discussion was that scholarship encompasses all of these areas. Research and artistic creativity belong to scholarship…

Jennifer R. asked if these themes have a life beyond the accreditation process. The Provost said that the expectation of the accreditors is that the university does a lot of communication with the outside world about our mission. It's anticipated by the leadership group that we would talk widely about our mission and the accreditation themes that have been chosen. They're not written to be solely internal to the university. The extent to which we'll base publications on them and so forth depends upon what we're trying to say to our external constituencies. Jennifer noted that if we're using the themes to develop a mission statement, that's a different matter; but, if we're just developing them for the accreditation process then it's really important to keep in mind the implications that were shared today about how they'll be used in the accreditation process. The Provost responded that 80% or more of the theme development is for the accreditation process and they'll drive the work of getting the accreditation documents together.

Dana T. noted the time constraint issue the university is facing, forcing the process for developing and discussing these to be drastically shortened. In 2012 a whole new set of themes could be developed.

Ken A. spoke about addition of the "sustainability" word to "economic development" in the *Engage* theme. He supports sustainable economic development, using the example of what's being done at Chena Hot Springs. But, given its viability because of our location, it's not feasible to focus exclusively on that. Other faculty at SOM have voiced this same concern, also, about having the word "sustainable" be a qualifier of the phrase "economic development." The need is acknowledged for development of sustainable energy sources in the long-term as the pipeline declines. At this point, though, we need to focus on economic development as a whole for the state.

Rainer commented that recent research has shown that the temperature of water at the hot springs is dropping because of the extraction of so much hot water. It is not proving to be sustainable. What does and does not constitute "sustainable" can be a very tricky matter. He supports removal of the word from the theme. Jennifer R. differentiated between

"environmental" and "economic" sustainability, and stated that if environmental sustainability is what is being referred to in the theme, it should more clearly state that fact, or vice versa. Andy A. echoed Jennifer's statement that "ecological" and "economic" sustainability are two very different things.

Jon D. asked for two votes. The first vote was whether or not to retain the word "sustainable" in the *Engage* theme. The Senate voted unanimously to take out the word "sustainable" from the *Engage* theme, with one abstention.

The second vote was regarding the issue of separating the *Discover* theme. There were five votes in favor of separating the *Discover* theme as discussed; and 14 votes against separating the Discover theme. There were three abstentions.

        C.   Recap of the AC Meeting with Follett Bookstore Reps, and the
                   Open Forums – Jon Dehn

Jon recapped the results of the Administrative Committee's meeting with Follett representatives. A "pop-up" bookstore will be available at the beginning of the semesters when classes are starting. They are going to have their own manager for that store. They'll also scan more first chapters and make those available to students. It should work more smoothly without the email switchover problem.

        D.   Academic Calendar Issues – Falk Huettmann, Ken Abramowicz

Ken A. mentioned the problem they're having with the academic calendar: all the semesters and the new 'mesters are adding up to 53 weeks needed to operate them all. Faculty Senate had voted to have spring semesters start after Martin Luther King Day, so in order for Summer Session I (SS I) to end by the Fourth of July, it means that in many years there would have to be a five-week SS I or it overlaps with the two-week Maymester. They must consider the options of having a one-week Maymester, or have it overlap with SS I, or have a five-week-long SS I.

Amber T. commented that the English department will not support a five-week SS-I, and they will not support the 'mesters with two-week courses. Students can not do all the reading and required writing in that short timeframe.

Cecile L. said Summer Sessions is driving the problem with the short two-week 'mesters. She doesn't want to allow the two-week 'mesters, saying it makes no sense in terms of pedagogy. Jennifer R. suggested they frame it in terms of priorities. First priority is the regular fall and spring semesters, second is the regular summer six-week-long sessions, and third are the 'mesters. Jane W. agreed, and said that two short 'mesters could still fit. Jon D. supported these priorities and reminded folks about the Chancellor's statement that he would approve a five-week-long SS I only this one time.

Ken A. mentioned OIT's concern that we're not allowing for their required downtime for maintenance and upgrades to the technology systems.

Jon D. mentioned there are also Core classes being offered in the 'mesters. This may not go over well in accreditation and probably needs some discussion. Ken A. said they'll frame a motion out of Curricular Affairs.

       E.   ACFWRU Faculty Status – Jennifer Reynolds
              (Attachment 163/5)

Jennifer reported on the recommendation they were asked to give the Provost regarding the status here at UAF of five faculty in the Alaska Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit (ACFWRU). The recommendation of the Faculty Affairs Committee is provided in the attachment which is a copy of the memo written to the Provost. They made three recommendations: 1.) call them affiliate faculty as their employer is with the federal or state government and they are not UAF employees (thus defining a range of rights and responsibilities for them); 2.) they should not participate in Faculty Senate because they're not UAF employees with regard to the shared governance principle; and 3.) if the MOU is renegotiated, then UAF should be sure to involve the three affected units of SFOS, IAB, and CNSM where these faculty serve.

Jon D. added that in the presenate meeting discussion with the Chancellor and Provost it was agreed that it's time to renegotiate this MOU with the involvement of the affected units, and BOR policy restricts how these faculty are handled. If they're designated as affiliate faculty which seems most appropriate, there may still need to be some exceptions granted to them, such as having offices provided for them on campus, for example.

       F.   Roles of the Vice Chancellor for Research Position – Roger Hansen

They were asked by the Chancellor to summarize the roles expected of a vice chancellor for research (VCR). They're still working on that and want to bring discussion of some of those roles of a VCR to the Senate. The previous position was held as a vice provost of research, and they'd like to discuss which of these roles seems the most appropriate for the position. A draft response to the question regarding the title of the position is provided at the back of the room as a hand-out. The consensus of the ad hoc committee is that it should be a vice chancellor rank as opposed to a vice-provost. They're meeting this Thursday to talk more about roles, and they'll be talking to the Office of Sponsored Programs, and Grants and Contracts.

Jon D. added that this discussion will also help to define the committee's role as they look at the VCR roles and how those affect the campus and related policies and procedures.

X   Committee Reports

Committee Reports were deferred because the meeting ran overtime.

      A. Curricular Affairs – Ken Abramowicz / Falk Huettmann (Attachment 163/6)

      B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds (Attachment 163/7)

C. Unit Criteria - Brenda Konar, Julie McIntyre

D. Committee on the Status of Women – Alex Fitts / Jane Weber (Attachment 163/8)

E. Core Review - Latrice Laughlin

F. Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – Charlie Sparks

H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa

I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Rajive Ganguli

J. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy

K. Ad Hoc Committee: Advisory Research Committee – Roger Hansen

XI   Members' Comments/Questions

No comments or questions.

XII   Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 PM.